Question Number	RFP Section Reference	Paragraph No.	Page No.	Question or Comment	Response
524	C.3.1.2.1 Comply with Policies and Procedures		C-16	Are the Contractor's systems required to be C&A'ed in accordance with NIST SP 800-37	Yes. The SP 800-37 section incorporates FISMA compliance, and OMB guidance on the same. The most recen guidance issued included explicit language requiring any system that handles government data to be C&A'd in the same manner as the federally owned system; not as good as, or equivalent to, but the same. The original language identifies contractor system responsibilities as "Each federal agency shall develop, document, and implement an agency-wide information security program to provide information security for the information and information systems that support the operations and assets of the agency, including those provided or managed by another agency, contractor, or other source..." While the OMB guidance (July 6, 2005) for FY 2004 added the instructions "Agency systems shall include information systems used or operated by an agency. Contractor systems shall include information systems used or operated by a contractor of an agency or other organization or behalf of an agency. The total number of systems shall include both agency systems and contractor systems." And "Agencies are responsible for ensuring the security of information systems used by a contractor of their agency or other organization on behalf of their agency, therefore, self reporting by contractors does not meet the requirements of law. Self reporting by another Federal agency, for example, a Federal service provider, may be sufficient. Agencies and service providers have a shared responsibility for FISMA compliance. "
525	Attachment B.5 MDO			Please provide the addresses, or remove any facilities from the MDO without address.	The attached site code and corresponding NPA NXX values are being supplied in response to questions about these missing values. Please complete the MDO with this additional information; this constitutes supplementmental information to the existing MDO. Please also include these values in pricing tables for local loop prices (updated attachment B-3 is included).
526				Do we need to submit past performance questionnaires if we are using the same past performance information?	No, updated past performance questionnaires are not required if you are submitting the same past performance information.
527	Section L			Section L contains no directions on how to handle Amendment 8 changes to the proposal. Does Treasury require a submission of a complete proposal, addressing Amendment 8 and all previous Amendments and the RFP, or only change pages as affected by Amendment 8?	All revisions should be addressed in the Offeror's cover letter with specific references to the revised proposal. Revisions in the body of the proposals should be clearly marked. The Offeror shall highlight the updated area to signify the change and shall note the change in the cover letter. However, if the Offeror is simply making minor editorial changes, it shall also use the track changes function for added clarity.
528	General	n/a	n/a	What Media does Treasury require for submission of changes? Does Treasury want only electronic and paper copies? If Treasure wants paper copies, how may copies does Treasury want?	Please reference Section L for submission requirements. Proposals shall be submitted in the same media as cited in the RFP as released.
529	C.3.2.1 Develop Transition Plan		C-21	For purposes of creating a revised Transition Plan, what date should offerors assume the contract will be awarded?	The contemplated award date is May 1, 2006. For EVALUATION PURPOSES ONLY and to complete their proposed transition plan, the Offerors should assume the transition will begin on May 1, 2006 and be complete by January 31, 2007.
530				In accordance with amendment 008, will Treasury entertain revised architecture and or network design at this stage or is the Treasury simply asking for a review of our original submission revised pricing?	The Offeror may submit either a revised architecture/network design or their original design with its revised pricing. The Offeror shall ensure that any changes are clearly noted in their revised proposal submission. Also, reference Question #527.
531				Will Treasury provide information on the locations, size, vendor and circuit ID's of all campus metro SONET rings, along with potential add drop locations for MPLS?	Treasury does not own the SONET rings. Offerors should propose their optimal solution and not constrain their solutions to current architecture.
532				Are existing Metro rings owned and operated by Treasury or by the existing WAN providers?	Treasury does not own any metro rings. They are provided by the ILEC.
533	General	n/a	n/a	Can Treasury clarify when it expects transition to begin and end?	As stated in the original RFP the transition shall be completed 9 months after acceptance of the final transition plan. For EVALUATION PURPOSES ONLY, the Offerors should assume a transition start date of May 1, 2006 and end date of January 31, 2007.
534	General			Please provide an estimated award date for this procurement.	Reference Question #529.
535	F.4 Annual Scorecard Methodology			This section refers to an annual performance scorecard. Is the goal of the annual scorecard to track past performance for a past performance rating or is it tied to option year renewal? The monthly performance targets are tied to invoice credits, so we are trying to determine what the annual scorecard results will be used for.	The annual scorecard will be used by Treasury to determine the contractor's past performance record. Exercising of option years will be conducted by the Contracting Officer in strict accordance with FAR 17.207.

Question Number	RFP Section Reference	Paragraph No.	Page No.	Question or Comment	Response
536	General	n/a	n/a	Please clarify what form of response the Government is expecting in response to Amendment 0008: (a) just change pages only, or (b) complete amended Volumes I - IV, or (c) originals of Volumes I - IV plus change pages.	Reference Question #527.
537	General	n/a	n/a	Does the Government plan to update all deadline dates specified in Amendment 0008? For example, Sections C.3.2.1 and C.3.2.1.4 still specify the transition from TCS to TCE is to be completed by September 27, 2005.	The September 27, 2005 date will be updated via a change page in Amendment 0011.
538	C.3.1.2.1 Comply with Policies and Procedures		C-16	What is the FIPS 199 Impact Level assigned to the TCE data?	There is not a single FIPS 199 classification of impact for all TCE data, but rather there will be a range of low-medium-high potential impacts for various types of information and information systems, should certain events occur which jeopardize the information and information systems needed by the organization to accomplish its assigned mission, protect its assets, fulfill its legal responsibilities, etc. The successful TCE bidder, in reviewing the requirements for each client, as part of the transition planning process, will need to solicit the impact classification information for that client's data. Part of that process can be based upon NIST SP 800-60, "Guide for Mapping Types of Information and Information Systems to Security Categories" provides a taxonomy of information types for some of the data that TCE will handle [but again, not any national security type data, including official security classified (e.g. Secret, Top Secret, etc.)]; a plan to address this will also have to be developed as part of the transition process.
539	SF 30 Box 14, #4		1	How long is the Contractor's proposal required to be valid?	Proposals should be revalidated until the contemplated contract award date of May 1, 2006.
540				In the course of previous questions, the Government indicated that no further input would be forthcoming relative to missing or invalid NPA-NXXs. Since Local Loop pricing is generally NPA-NXX based, would the Government please provide guidance regarding how vendors should address these NPA-NXXs in their price proposals so as to assure consistency across all proposals?	Reference Question #548.
541	C.3.2.1 Conduct Transition from TCS to TCE		C-21	Please clarify Section C.3.2.1 "Conduct Transition from TCS to TCE." It currently states "successfully completed by September 27th, 2005". We assume that this revised date should be September 27, 2006. Please confirm this assumption.	Reference Questions #529 and #537.
542				In several of the government's instructions, it is stated that year 1 consists of a 9-month period. In addition, the instructions indicate that all B table pricing should be as monthly prices. However, in the B-4 Summary table, formulas have been written to pull in the monthly totals from the CoS 1, 2, and 3 worksheets for the totals of the monthly rates for transport, access and enhancements for each year. These monthly totals are then added together in the Annual Total line. Should the Annual Total formulas not include a multiplier of 9 in year 1 and a multiplier of 12 for all other years in order to create the correct Annual Totals?	The summary should multiply the monthly totals by the appropriate number of months for the given year to generate that year's total. So, year 1 should multiply the monthly total by 9 months to get the year 1 annual total. Year 2 and all subsequent years should multiply the monthly total by 12 months to get the annual total.
543	Attachment B-4			In table B-4 there are columns for Enhancement CLINs and price in each of the three CoS worksheets. This suggests that a separate Enhancement CLIN and price would be required for each CoS. However, the instructions indicate that the Enhancement CLIN would be driven by the largest bandwidth requirement, which based on the 80/20 rule would always be CoS3. Please clarify that this is the Government's intent and our interpretation of this requirement.	Reference Amendment 0009.

Question Number	RFP Section Reference	Paragraph No.	Page No.	Question or Comment	Response
544	C.3.2.1(c), Conduct Transition From TCS to TCE		C-21	This Section states "Strict adherence to the post-award schedule – neither ahead of nor behind schedule will be acceptable to the Government." Our interpretation of "post-award schedule" is the schedule that is agreed upon with the Government post-award. Is this a correct interpretation?	That is a correct interpretation. The draft transition schedule will be finalized via coordination between government and contractor personnel, and that final schedule must be strictly followed as availability of site personnel, migration of applications, and so forth need to be carefully coordinated by the government.
545	L L.10.4 Volume IV - Price Proposal	Tab E	L-15	This section requests the bidders to design a solution using the baseline TCS traffic found in tables J-2e, J-2g, and J-2h. The solution is to be populated for each site found in B-4 MDO spreadsheet. We are unable to find traffic for ARL027 and RES002. Please advise how the bidders should treat these sites in the B-4 MDO table.	Please remove sites ARL027 and RES002 from the MDO.
546				Since the legacy TCS equipment is a year older, its intrinsic value is further reduced. Will Treasury remove the proposed plan for exchange/sale from the evaluation criteria?	No.
547				In supplying the speed requirements in tier 3 locations, will Treasury specify if the desired speeds below T-1 are a theoretical maximum or a guaranteed minimum?	There are no theoretical maximums or guaranteed minimums. Any increment of bandwidth may be ordered at a given site.
548	Attachment B-2			There are 11 sites without NPANXXs. Will the government please provide?	Reference updated Attachment B-3 and the updated MDO information, both in Amendment 0011.
549	Attachment B-1 - FedTeds			Attachment B-1 is missing from the FedTeds site. Will the government please provide?	Attachment B-1 is available with the solicitation on the IRS Website.
550	Attachment L-7 Summary Price for all years for TCE			How will the different components listed in: "Attachment L-7 Summary Price for all years for TCE" be weighted in terms of their evaluation.?	No weights will be applied. Totals contained in the Attachment L-7 will be added to derive an evaluated price.
551				Will the government apply a different evaluation weighting to the pricing of the three (3) base years vs. the option years pricing?	No, the Government will use the total evaluated price. Reference L.10.4 and M.3.5 of Amendment 0008.
552	M.3.5 Price Evaluation			"To be considered for award, the Offeror must submit fixed prices that comply with the requirements of the RFP. For purposes of an award decision, the total TCE evaluated price will be the sum of the total Model Delivery Order Price, the total Enterprise Directory Services Price, the total Link Encryption Price, and the total Time and Materials Price as set forth in Section L.10.4, Tab D and will be evaluated in accordance with FAR Part 15.404-1(b), Price analysis, and for completeness and accuracy." Will the total TCE evaluated price for evaluation purposes include only the sum of the above mentioned items and be based on the total sum of all fixed priced units included in those price items (i.e., Model Delivery Order Price, Enterprise Directory Services Price, Link Encryption Price, Time and Materials Price)?	Totals contained in the Attachment L-7 will be added to derive an evaluated price. Reference M.2 and M.3.5.
553	General	n/a	n/a	Please clarify what form of response the Government is expecting in response to Amendment 0008: (a) just change pages only, or (b) complete amended Volumes I - IV, or (c) originals of Volumes I - IV plus change pages.	Reference Question #527.
554	Attachments B-table	n/a	n/a	Attachment B-4 contains separate tabs/worksheets for each Class of Service. Treasury also provided another file, 'MDO Example_Attachment_B-x_template_example.xls', that provides annotated examples of how the MDO is to be developed, and this file contains a significantly different format in that there is a single tab/worksheet for all Classes of Service. Can the Government please clarify this discrepancy and provide guidance to the proper MDO format to be completed by the bidders?	Reference Amendment 0009.

Question Number	RFP Section Reference	Paragraph No.	Page No.	Question or Comment	Response
555	Attachments	n/a	n/a	We assume that per section L bidders should use Attachment L-5 for CoS 1 traffic, and not 'MDO Example_CoS 1 Traffic Dummy Values.xls'. Please confirm.	That is correct - Offerors should use L-5 for CoS1 traffic. The MDO Example files are for illustrative purpose only.
556	Table J			The J Tables do not provide sufficient detail for us to be able to accurately price services outside the Continental United States. For example, an NPA/NXX in Alaska can service a customer within 1 mile of the Local Carrier Central Office or more than 800 miles away. The cost impact on the local loop, just in this example, is substantial and could range from $250 per month to $25,000 or more. In addition, Treasury is requesting extended wiring at many of the sites with little or no information upon which to base our price. This lack of detailed information will leave it to each bidder to make assumptions that may not be in the best interest of the Government and will make it more difficult for the Government to perform a fair evaluation between vendors. We feel this information is critical for accurate pricing of our solution. Would you please provide detailed site information for your OCONUS locations, including the full street addresses and full phone numbers for the OCONUS locations.	Reference Question #525.
557	B-table Attachments			Section B.2.1 and table B-6 MDO Cling.xls both reference Category 1 sites at 1.544 Mbps thru 10Gbps speeds. The B tables for local access do not include a table to price Category 1 sites at 1.544 Mbps thru 30Mbps. Should a table be included for local access at 1.544Mbps thru 30Mbps for Category 1 locations?	No, these transport bandwidth CLINs would be carried over a minimum 45 Mbps loop. These large, Category 1 sites typically use a great deal of bandwidth. Further, the bandwidth may be comprised of multiple classes of services. For example, a site may have 1.5Mpbs of CoS1 and 30 Mbps of CoS3. The 45 Mbps loop would be used to carry the aggregated bandwidth of 31.5 Mbps.
558				In RFP Section L, Tab F "Price Proposal - Price Evaluation Model Delivery Order", Paragraph 4, the treasury states, "...The Offeror shall populate the model delivery order with pricing that represents a single month of each year as per the CLINs in attachments B-1, B-2, and B-3..." In evaluating attachment B-4, we have identified many sites that are listed in the evaluation model however, not included in attachments B-2 and B-3. For example, site AUS030, 2102 St. Elmo, suite 450, Austin, TX 78744 is a Category 1 site, but not listed in Table B-2. Likewise, site DAT001, 200 W. 2nd St, Dayton, OH 45402 is also listed as a Category 1 site, but not listed in Table B-2. Will the treasury be providing a revised evaluation model to reflect only those locations that are listed in the required B-2 and B-3 tables?	Reference updated Attachment B-2 of Amendment 0011 for correct site address information for the referenced site codes.